

THE ETHICAL THEORY OF IMAGES  
FORMULATED BY THE ICONOCLASTS  
IN 754 AND 815

MILTON V. ANASTOS

This essay is a revised version of parts of the two papers on iconoclasm which I read at the Dumbarton Oaks Symposium of 1951.

AT their famous Council of 754, the iconoclasts, as is well known, did not denounce all representations of Christ but only those which attempted in one way or another to simulate his outward form or appearance by means of painting or sculpture. In fact, they specifically endorsed what they called the image of Christ as set forth in the Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> This fact and the orthodox reply thereto, that the Eucharist was actually Christ himself, not merely his image,<sup>2</sup> are familiar to all students of the subject. Many, however, seem not to be aware that the iconoclasts at the same time announced their approval of still another, and, from the ethical point of view, at least, more significant conception of an image, which described the virtues of the saints as living images and called for their imitation. According to this definition of images, one should put reliance, not upon pictorial representations, but upon the scriptures and the biographies of the saints.

This spiritual or ethical interpretation of the image is probably to be understood as a part of the iconoclastic campaign to purify Christian worship of what many took to be superstitious and idolatrous practices. Our knowledge of these iconoclastic efforts in the direction of reform, dating from the so-called First Iconoclastic period (726–787), we owe principally to the text of the *ὁρος* (Horos, or dogmatic definition) and anathemas pronounced by the iconoclastic Council of 754, which have been preserved to us in their refutation by the orthodox party (which favored the use of images) at the Sixth Session (Tomoi 5 and 6, respectively) of the Seventh Oecumenical Council, held in Nicaea in 787. For reasons I have stated elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> this version of the proceedings of the Council of 754 may be accepted without the slightest reserve as a reliable record of iconoclastic doctrine and belief.

Apart from a brief general introduction and conclusion, the florilegium of 754 consists of eight excerpts from the fathers, of which all but two deal with what I shall, for the sake of brevity, call the ethical theory of the image.

<sup>1</sup> J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 13 (Florence, 1767, in the anastatic reprint, Paris – Leipzig, 1902, cited below as Mansi, 13), 261 D–264 C. For the large and growing bibliography on the iconoclastic controversy, I must refer to my forthcoming article in the new edition of the fourth volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History*.

<sup>2</sup> Mansi, 13, 264 D–268 A.

<sup>3</sup> “The argument for iconoclasm as presented by the iconoclastic Council of 754,” *Late classical and mediaeval studies in honor of Professor Albert Matthias Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1954). In what follows I repeat, for the sake of the argument, which would otherwise be difficult to follow, a very small (and revised) portion of my summary of the *ὁρος* of 754.

In the first of the other two, Athanasius maintains that it is ridiculous for sentient beings to pray to insensate objects, since salvation cannot be obtained from what is created. In the second, the ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius of Caesarea, writing to the Empress Constantia, contends that it is impossible to produce an image of Christ because the presence of the divine within him at all stages of his existence put him beyond the range of mortal images. Thus the florilegium lays considerable stress upon the spiritual view of the image.<sup>4</sup>

The basic principle underlying this concept occurs in the first quotation in the florilegium, which comes from Epiphanius of Cyprus, who had urged his people not to set up images in churches, in cemeteries of the saints, or in private houses, but always to remember God in their hearts.<sup>5</sup> This idea lies behind the citation of a poem of Gregory of Nazianzus, according to whom "it is shameful to put trust in colors and not in the heart, for that [faith] which is in colors is easily washed away, while that which is in the depth of the mind is dear to me."<sup>6</sup> The florilegium then embraces a passage from a work attributed to St. John Chrysostom, who is reported as saying, "we enjoy the presence of the saints in their writings, in which we have images, not of their bodies, but of their souls, since their words are images of their souls."<sup>7</sup> The practical consequences of this doctrine are more clearly enunciated by Basil of Caesarea, who maintained, the iconoclasts say, that "the study of the holy writings constitutes the best path to the ascertainment of what is proper, because they provide a guide for conduct, together with the

<sup>4</sup> Mansi, 13, 300 E, 313 A–D. Actually, the six passages dealing with the ethical theory of images occupy 49 lines of space in Mansi as against 45 for Athanasius (6) and Eusebius (39), and 16 in the conclusion. But their relative importance can be gauged by the fact that the six passages on the spiritual view of the image are separately refuted by the orthodox spokesman at great length in approximately 8 full columns of Mansi (*ca.* 511 lines), while the other two texts get 5 columns (*ca.* 317 lines) of refutation.

In this paper, I do not discuss the ultimate sources used by the iconoclasts in formulating the ethical theory of the image. To this question I hope to return later. Cf. Jean Daniélou, *Origène* (Paris, 1948), 48; George Florovsky, "Origen, Eusebius and the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Church History*, 19 (1950), 91; Paul J. Alexander, *loc. cit.* (n. 13 below), 50, 56; Wigbert Hess, "Imago Dei," *Benediktinische Zeitschrift*, 29 (1953), 370–400, especially 385 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Mansi, 13, 292 DE: προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ κρατεῖτε τὰς παραδόσεις, ὥς παρελάβετε μὴ ἐκκλίνετε δεξιὰ, μηδὲ ἀριστερά . . . καὶ ἐν τούτῳ μνήμην ἔχετε, τέκνα ἀγαπητά, τοῦ μὴ ἀναφέρειν εἰκόνας ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας, μήτε ἐν τοῖς κοιμητηρίοις τῶν ἁγίων· ἀλλ' αἰεὶ διὰ μνήμης ἔχετε τὸν θεὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν· ἀλλ' οὕτε κατ' οἶκον κοινόν.

<sup>6</sup> Mansi, 13, 297 A: ὕβρις πίστιν ἔχειν ἐν χρώμασι, καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ. ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐν χρώμασιν εὐχερῶς ἐκπλύνεται· ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ βάθει τοῦ νοός, ἐκείνη ἐμοὶ προσφιλέσθαι.

<sup>7</sup> Mansi, 13, 300 A: ἡμεῖς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν τῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀπολαύομεν παρουσίας, οὐχὶ τῶν σωματῶν αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τῶν ψυχῶν τὰς εἰκόνας ἔχοντες. τὰ γὰρ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰρημένα, τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν εἰκόνες εἰσὶ.

biographies of the blessed ones, that serve as living images of a godly life and the inspiration for the emulation of god-like behavior.”<sup>8</sup>

Furthermore, the iconoclasts continue, invoking the authority of Amphilochius of Iconium, “there is no point in painting the physical faces of the saints with colors on tablets, since we do not need such things but rather to imitate their way of life by virtuous deeds of our own.”<sup>9</sup> A similar argument was made, they add, by Theodotus of Ancyra, the contemporary and theological ally of Cyril of Alexandria, for Theodotus believed that “we have been taught, not to fashion images of the saints by means of material colors, but rather to imitate their virtues, which are really living images, with the aid of what has been recorded about them in books, so that we may be stimulated in this way to a zeal like theirs.”<sup>10</sup>

The same thought is latent, though not directly expressed, in the eighth anathema of the Council of 754, which condemns anyone who would contemplate the incarnate Logos “through the medium of material colors, and does not worship him with the whole heart, with the eyes of the mind, as he sits *in excelsis*, more dazzling than the sun, at the right hand of God, on the throne of glory.”<sup>11</sup> The whole case in behalf of this type of image is summarized in the sixteenth anathema of the Council as follows:

If anyone ventures to set up profitless figures of all the saints in soul-less, speech-less images made of material colors — for this is a vain invention and the discovery of diabolical craft — and does not, on the contrary, reproduce their virtues in himself as actually living images, with the aid of what has been recorded about them in books, in order to be stimulated to zeal like theirs, as our inspired fathers have said, let him be anathema.<sup>12</sup>

This iconoclastic doctrine of the image has much to recommend it, and would undoubtedly have commanded universal assent as an ethical principle,

<sup>8</sup> Mansi, 13, 300 AB: μεγίστη γὰρ ὁδὸς πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καθήκοντος εὕρεσιν . . . ἡ μελέτη τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν· ἐν ταύταις γὰρ καὶ αἱ τῶν πράξεων ὑποθήκαι εὐρίσκονται, καὶ οἱ βίοι τῶν μακαρίων ἀνδρῶν ἀνάγραπτοι παραδεδομένοι, οἷον τινες εἰκόνες ἑμψυχοὶ τῆς κατὰ θεὸν πολιτείας, τῷ μιμήματι τῶν κατὰ θεὸν ἔργων προκείμενοι.

<sup>9</sup> Mansi, 13, 301 D: οὐ γὰρ τοῖς πίναξι τὰ σαρκικὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων διὰ χρωμάτων ἐπιμελὲς ἡμῖν ἐντυποῦν, ὅτι οὐ χρῆζομεν τούτων, ἀλλὰ τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτῶν δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκμιμῆσθαι.

<sup>10</sup> Mansi, 13, 309 E–312 A: τὰς τῶν ἁγίων ιδέας οὐκ ἐν εἰκόσιν ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναμορφοῦν παρελήφαμεν, ἀλλὰ τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷον τινὰς ἑμψύχους εἰκόνας ἀναμάττεσθαι δεδιδάγμεθα, ἐκ τούτου πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς διεγειρόμενοι ζῆλον.

<sup>11</sup> Mansi, 13, 336 E: εἴ τις τὸν θεῖον τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγον χαρακτῆρα κατὰ τὴν σάρκωσιν δι' ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἐπιτηδεύει κατανοῆσαι, καὶ μὴ ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας προσκυνῇ αὐτὸν ὁμμασι νοεροῖς, ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ὑψίστοις ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης καθήμενον, ἀνάθεμα.

<sup>12</sup> Mansi, 13, 345 CD: εἴ τις τὰς τῶν ἀπάντων ἁγίων ιδέας ἐν εἰκόσιν ἀψύχους καὶ ἀναύδοις ἐξ ὑλικῶν χρωμάτων ἀναστηλοῦν ἐπιτηδεύει, μηδεμίαν ὄνησιν φερούσας· ματαία γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπίνοια, καὶ διαβολικῆς μεθοδείας εὗρεσις· καὶ οὐχὶ δὴ μᾶλλον τὰς τούτων ἀρετὰς διὰ τῶν ἐν γραφαῖς περὶ αὐτῶν δηλουμένων οἷον τινὰς ἑμψύχους εἰκόνας ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἀναζωγραφεῖ, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ὅμοιον αὐτοῖς ἐκ τούτου διεγείρεται ζῆλον, καθὼς οἱ ἐνθεοὶ ἡμῶν ἔφησαν πατέρες, ἀνάθεμα.

even in orthodox circles, had it not been combined with hostility to other, more conventional kinds of images. It is not surprising, therefore, that it was revived during the second iconoclastic controversy (813–843) and was incorporated in the Acts of the iconoclastic Council of 815 convoked by the iconoclastic Emperor Leo V (813–820).

This time, the theory of the image propounded by the Council of 754 is to be found only in the florilegium of patristic authorities. From what remains of the Acts of the Council of 815, there is no indication that this idea penetrated also into the anathemas of that council, although it is not impossible that it may have appeared in a portion of the proceedings that is no longer extant. In the reconstruction of the florilegium of 815, which we owe to the patient labors of Professor Paul Alexander,<sup>13</sup> it can be seen that the iconoclasts of 815 copied out five of the total of six passages in the florilegium of 754 that were concerned with the view of images here under review, taking over with little or no change the quotations from Epiphanius, Gregory, John Chrysostom, Amphilochius, and Theodotus. Because of their brevity and conciseness, these texts make up what is in some ways the strongest expression of this theory of the image in the entire history of iconoclasm. Indeed, the clearest and fullest of these, that of Theodotus, represents this doctrine of the image in all its facets more precisely and more unambiguously than any of the new passages introduced into the florilegium by the iconoclasts of 815. This can be made clear from the following summary:<sup>14</sup>

A. Texts bearing more or less directly upon the ethical theory of images.

18. Asterius of Amaseia (MPG, 40, 168 B) warns against painting figures of Christ, since it was enough that Christ had humiliated himself

<sup>13</sup> Until recently our knowledge of the proceedings of the Council of 815 was limited to the fragments collected and published by Daniel Serruys, "Les Actes du concile iconoclaste de l'an 815," *École Française de Rome, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 23 (1903), 345–351. This collection of fragments was improved and revised by Georg Ostrogorsky, *Studien zur Geschichte des byzantinischen Bilderstreites, Historische Untersuchungen*, 5 (Breslau, 1929), 48–51. Both of these scholars gleaned their material from the treatise Nicephorus wrote to refute the work of the iconoclasts in 815; both of them confined their search to the *ῥπος* of 815. Recently, Professor Paul Alexander has carried out further dredging operations in the same stream and has come up with a number of hitherto undiscovered fragments of the *ῥπος*, plus a considerable portion of the florilegium of 815: "The iconoclastic Council of St. Sophia (815) and its Definition (*Horos*)," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, No. 7 (1953), 37–66.

<sup>14</sup> I give brief summaries of the patristic texts assembled by the iconoclasts, restricting myself here to epitomizing the material at hand. Critical questions of authorship, as well as a detailed critique of the florilegium as a whole, I postpone to another time. The numeration of the fragments is that of Alexander, *loc. cit.* On excerpts 29 (Nilus to Olympiodorus) and 30 C (Epiphanius to Theodosius), see Gabriel Millet, "Les iconoclastes et la croix, à propos d'une inscription de Cappadoce," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 34 (1910), 99 f.

once at the time of the incarnation, and urges men to carry the incorporeal Logos spiritually (*νοητῶς*) in their souls.

19. A certain Leontius, commenting on Luke 9.28, remarks on the difficulty of producing an image (*εἰκόνα*) of Christ, since he had appeared in many different guises – in the baptism, in the transfiguration, in the crucifixion, in the tomb, and in the resurrection. “If you want a likeness (*ὁμοιωσίδιον*) of Christ,” Leontius says, “lay it in your heart, for the Lord cannot be represented in an image.”

20. Theodotus of Ancyra (from 754), here described as Theodotus of Galatia.

21. Basil of Seleuceia: Men should not honor those who have lived virtuous lives by means of pagan colors but should be reminded of them by studying written records and be spurred to imitate their zeal.

22. Amphilochius of Iconium (from 754, with additions emphasizing the value of reading about the saints).

23. Basil of Caesarea (MPG, 44, 273 AB) stresses man’s ability to make himself like God and contrasts this with the vanity and futility of images.

25. Gregory of Nazianzus (from 754).

26. Christ should not be depicted by visual means, John Chrysostom objects, since he dwells in heaven, governs the universe, suffers when a soul rejects him, and is nourished only by the salvation of believers.

28. John Chrysostom (from 754).

30 A. Epiphanius (from 754).

30 B. In a long series of excerpts from Epiphanius, in which images are denounced for a number of reasons, the faithful are admonished to emulate the patriarchs and the prophets (p. 63), and, also, as it would seem, although the Greek is a little peculiar (p. 64. 3f.: *οὐκοῦν εἰκόνας αὐτῶν τὰς αὐτῶν ἐντολὰς δι’ ἀρετῶν στήσωμεν*), to regard the commandments of the apostles as models (or images) for imitation.

#### B. Iconoclastic texts irrelevant to the ethical theory of images.

17. A text from the Apostolic Constitutions warns against the use of unsuitable (i.e., pictorial) decoration (*ἄκοσμον κόσμον*) in the representation of the cross.

24. According to Gregory of Nyssa one should not worship the form of the Servant, but God the Logos, existing in the glory of the Father and in the form of God.<sup>15</sup>

27. John Chrysostom alludes to a sculptural (?) representation of the

<sup>15</sup> I have transferred this text from the relevant list in which Alexander, *loc. cit.*, p. 44, places it, because it seems to me to have nothing to do with the ethical theory of images.

story of Genesis 18 (Abraham, Sarah, and the three angels), and rejects this and other similar works of pagan inspiration.

29. Nilus advises Olympiodorus (MPG, 79, 577 D) that, except for an incised cross, the sanctuary should remain free of pictorial adornment.

30 C. In a letter to the Emperor Theodosius I, Epiphanius rejects images on account of the lack of patristic warrant for their use, and urges the Emperor to order, under penalty of a fine, that textiles decorated with images of the apostles or of the prophets or of Christ be used for the burial of the poor, that wall paintings be obliterated, and that mosaics be removed, or at least that no more be laid, since the fathers had authorized no figures except that of the cross.

30 D. Epiphanius relates how he deliberately tore down a hanging because it had a representation of Christ or one of the saints, and suggested that it be used to bury some poor man. In replacing this curtain by a plain one, he asks that no such works (i.e., none decorated with images) be placed in the churches.

From this résumé it can be seen that, of the twelve excerpts added to the florilegium of 754 by the iconoclasts of 815, only six (or seven if we count number 24, which is not really pertinent) are concerned with the ethical theory of the image: a text of Epiphanius (30 B), which is the only one of the new texts that states the full doctrine of the florilegium of 754 as summarized in the sixteenth anathema of its *ῥος* (translated above; see n. 12), two others (from Basil of Seleuceia [21] and Basil of Caesarea [23]), which allude to it in one way or another, two more (from Asterius [18] and Leontius [19]), which are cited as witnesses for the slightly less explicit, but closely related, form of the “ethical” definition of the image, i.e., that Christians should carry the image of Christ in their souls, and another from Chrysostom (26), which touches upon salvation. Thus the florilegium of 754, much of which is incorporated within that of 815, as we have seen, was reinforced in 815 by a number of additional patristic citations, which were, however, inspired by those collected in 754, the iconoclasts of 815 having been unable, according to the so-called *Scriptor incertus de Leone*, to find patristic authorities for their hostility to images until they secured the records of the Council of 754, which guided them in their search for appropriate texts.<sup>16</sup> The relationship between the two florilegia described above tends to

<sup>16</sup> P.G., 108, 1025 AB: καὶ δὴ συναγαγόντες πλήθη πολλὰ βιβλίων, ἐποιοῦντο ἐν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἔρευναν, πλὴν οὐδὲν εὑρισκόν οἱ ἄφρονες ὥνπερ αὐτοὶ κακούργως ἐπεξήτουν, ἕως οὗ μετὰ χεῖρας ἔλαβον τὸ συνοδικὸν [sic legendum puto] Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Ἰσαύρου, τοῦ καὶ Καβαλλίνου, καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰς ἀρχὰς λαβόντες, ἤρξαντο καὶ ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις εὑρίσκειν τὰς χρήσεις, ὥσπερ αὐτοὶ ἀφρόνως καὶ ἀνοήτως προέφερον, σημάδια βάλλοντες εἰς τοὺς τόπους, ἐνθα ἠῤῥισκον, βουλόμενοι πείσαι τὸν ἄφρονα λαόν, ὅτι Ἐν παλαιαῖς βιβλίοις εἶρομεν τοῦ μὴ προσκυνεῖσθαι τὰς εἰκόνας.



corroborate this statement. Statistics are of little account in such matters, but it is perhaps of some interest to note that some of the material (30 C and 30 D) added to the florilegium of 754 by the iconoclasts is quite long, while 30 B, cited above as supporting the "ethical" theory, extends for forty lines of small type on a quarto page, and is actually made up of eleven quotations, only a very few of which (two or three) are directly concerned with the "ethical" theory. If we count each folio reference in Alexander's edition of the florilegium separately, we find a total of twenty-eight excerpts (five from the florilegium of 754 and twenty-three new ones), of which approximately one half (five repeated from 754, the six discussed above, and perhaps two or at most three more of the component parts of Alexander's fragment 30 B) treat of the "ethical" theory.

As a result of this examination we must conclude that the florilegium of the Council of 815 does not advance beyond the iconoclastic theology of the earlier period. Thus the florilegium of 815, which had been unknown until its fortunate discovery and publication by Alexander, fully justifies the conclusion of previous scholars that its authors made no original contributions, and merely re-used materials or repeated arguments current among the iconoclasts of 754. The most that can be said is that the iconoclasts of 815 added 12 (or 28) patristic references to the florilegium of 754, none of which, however, can be regarded as constituting an innovation or substantial addition to the iconoclastic armory.

The above analysis of the florilegia of 754 and 815 nullifies Professor Alexander's attempt<sup>17</sup> to demonstrate that the iconoclasts of 815 were innovators and were the first to introduce what I have been referring to as the "ethical" theory of the image, or what he calls the doctrine that "the only true image of Christ and of the saints is Man endowed with the Christian virtues" (pp. 44, 50). He does not realize that the "ethical" theory first appeared, and was strongly emphasized, as has been shown above, in 754, although in his edition of the fragments of the florilegium of 815, he four times<sup>18</sup> gives the reference by volume and page to the section of the florilegium of 754, from which the iconoclasts of 815 had copied these particular texts. He even quotes, in a footnote,<sup>19</sup> the sixteenth canon of the *ŏpos* of 754 (see above), which demolishes the hypothesis that the iconoclasts of 815

<sup>17</sup> *Loc. cit.*, 37, 44, 50 f.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 61 (Nos. 20, 22), 62 (Nos. 25, 28); 54 f., nn. 20, 22, 23. But is it not somewhat surprising to say (*ibid.*, p. 55, n. 22) that "fragments 20, 22, and 25 were indeed precious supports for the central thesis of 815," when the fact is that, together with the two other texts transplanted from 754 into the florilegium of 815, they are rather the inspiration, source, and heart of what he calls the "central thesis of 815"?

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 55, n. 23.

were the first to apply the “ethical” theory to the image controversy; and he goes so far as to state that: “The Council of Hieria [the Council of 754] had expressed, in one of its anathemas, what was to become the central thesis of the Council of St. Sophia” (i.e., that of 815). If he had noticed the close connection between this anathema and the passage from Theodotus included in both the florilegia of 754 and 815, he would never have claimed originality for the Council of 815. Moreover, he confuses the issue when he suggests at the end of note 23 that the Council of 754 is to be distinguished from that of 815 by reason of the former’s emphasis upon Christology. For, it should be noted, the *ῥπος* of the Council of 815 deals with Christology no less emphatically than that of 754, as Alexander would concede,<sup>20</sup> while the Patriarch Nicephorus (806–815) devotes 157 out of a total of 160 folios in his treatise on the Council of 815 to an attack upon its Christology, and only three to its doctrine of the true image.<sup>21</sup> The cardinal fact, which Alexander disregards, is that the florilegium of 815 is based upon, and derived from, that of 754.

Similarly, other features of the Council of 815 which Alexander deems distinctive can be traced back to the proceedings of 754. Thus the description of the saints by the iconoclasts of 815 as *τοὺς συμμόρφους αὐτοῦ ἁγίους* — “like Christ in form” (fr. 9, 30 B), which is patterned upon Romans 8.29, and the definition of images as “soulless” (fr. 13) — *ἀψύχους εἰκόσι* — or “false” (fr. 30 B) — *ψευδώνυμοι* — occur in 754.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, although we are reluctantly compelled to repudiate Alexander’s thesis on these points, his edition of the florilegium of 815 is of great interest and value both in itself and as a forerunner of the long-awaited publication of the entire text of Nicephorus’s treatise, upon which he has been working for many years.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 40 f.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>22</sup> *συμμόρφους*: Mansi, 13, 277 D; *εἰκόσιν ἀψύχους*: *ibid.*, 345 C and cf. 300 AB and 312 A (nn. 8, 10, 12 above); *ψευδώνυμοι*: *ibid.*, 260 B, 268 BC, and cf., for the use of *ψευδής* with regard to the iconoclasts, *ibid.*, 204 D, 205 A, 208 D.